

Alpine Amador Butte Calaveras Colusa Del Norte  
El Dorado Glenn Imperial Inyo Lake Lassen  
Madera Mariposa Merced Modoc



Mono Napa Nevada Placer Plumas San Benito  
Shasta Sierra Siskiyou Sutter Tehama  
Trinity Tulare Tuolumne Yolo Yuba

Chair - Kim Dolbow Vann, Colusa County  
First Vice Chair - Kevin Cann, Mariposa County  
Second Vice Chair - Nate Beason, Nevada County  
Past Chair - Diane Dillon, Napa County

President and CEO - Greg Norton  
Executive Vice President - Patricia J. Megason  
Chief Financial Officer - Karl Dolk

December 27, 2012

Mr. Phil Isenberg, Chair  
Delta Stewardship Council  
980 Ninth Street, Suite 1500  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: Recirculated Draft Delta Plan PEIR**

Dear Chairman Isenberg and Members of the Delta Stewardship Council:

On behalf of the thirty-two member counties of the Regional Council of Rural Counties (RCRC), I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Recirculated Draft Delta Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) released on November 30, 2012.

Given the short 45 day timeframe to review and comment on the Final Draft Delta Plan, the proposed draft regulations, and the Recirculated Draft Delta Plan PEIR, RCRC's comments will be limited to select issues of interest that include recommended changes.

RCRC agrees with the various organizations who have requested an extension of the comment period that the 45 day comment period for these three documents, which includes the holiday season, is inadequate.

RCRC's comments on the DEIR are limited to two technical issues:

**Page 3-2, Lines 29-37, Water Resources**

The language of this section states "The Revised Project would apply to areas of the Delta watershed located upstream of the Delta unlike the Proposed Project." RCRC recommends that this statement be clarified to read:

The Revised Project, unlike the Proposed Project, would apply to encourage areas of the Delta watershed located upstream of the Delta to improve water supply reliability ~~unlike the Proposed Project.~~

This revised sentence conforms to other verbiage in the document and eliminates potential confusion on the part of the reader as to the scope of the Council's

2012 DEC 28 PM 2:09  
RECEIVED  
DELTA COUNCIL  
MAILROOM

authority. As you know, only projects determined to qualify as a “covered action” come under the regulatory purview of the Council.

The use of the term “apply” would seem to imply regulation v. recommendation. The DEIR is comparing the Revised Project and the Proposed Project and asserting that they are different because the Revised Project is “recommending” that areas upstream of the Delta undertake projects to improve water supply reliability and that the Proposed Project did not.

As noted in RCRCs comments on the Final Draft Delta Plan, water suppliers are required to comply with a variety of existing laws relating to water (water conservation, water use efficiency, etc.). Confirming that these various requirements are being met is not within the purview of the Council - unless an action is determined to be a covered action.

### **Page 3-7 and 3-8, Lines 27-4, Water Resources**

As the Council knows, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) has commenced work on updating the Bay-Delta Plan. The State Water Board recently held three workshops to hear from scientific and technical experts to help inform their eventual decision. RCRC recommends that the statements contained in lines 27 through 4 as to the assumed outcome of the State Water Board’s decision be deleted from the document. These statements include the following:

“.....would likely result in a more natural flow regime in the Delta and Delta tributaries.”  
“.....would likely emphasize Delta ecosystem habitat beneficial uses by providing increased Delta outflows in the winter, spring, and fall months, and increased Delta inflows from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers in the winter and spring months.”  
“.....these water quality changes would benefit native species that evolved with the natural flow regime that the objectives would seek to emulate.”

Or, alternatively, the terms “if” and “could” could be inserted where appropriate. Use of these terms would conform to language found in other sections of the DEIR.

RCRC understands that a document the size of the DEIR has multiple authors. The use of the term “apply” (please see previous comments) can be found in various sections in the document, while in others greater clarity is provided with the use of “encourage”.

RCRC recommends that the Council opt for greater clarity and consistency within the DEIR. The use of this term throughout the various sections (Biological Resources, Delta Flood Risk, Land Use and Planning, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, etc.) appears to be largely associated with the discussion of reliable water supply.

**Page 4-11, Line 2, Biological Resources**

Please see previous comments relating to the Council's assumption as to the end result of the State Water Board's updating of the Bay-Delta Plan. At a minimum RCRC recommends that "would" be replaced with "could".

In conclusion, please feel free to contact me if you have any questions at (916) 447-4806 or [kmannion@rcrcnet.org](mailto:kmannion@rcrcnet.org).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kathy Mannion". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kathy" and last name "Mannion" clearly distinguishable.

Kathy Mannion  
Legislative Advocate

cc: Members, Delta Stewardship Council  
Mr. Chris Knopp, Executive Officer